Case: 19-30088 Doc# 1028 Filed: 03/24/19 Entered: 03/24/19 17:30:37 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

PG&E Corporation ("PG&E Corp.") and Pacific Gas and Electric Company (the "Utility"), as debtors and debtors in possession (collectively, "PG&E" or the "Debtors") in the above-captioned chapter 11 cases (the "Chapter 11 Cases"), hereby submit this reply in support of the Motion of Debtors Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 363(b) and 105(a) for Authority to Continue Performance Under Prepetition Settlement Agreement with Butte County District Attorney's Office to Fund Enhanced Fire Prevention and Communications Program (the "Butte County Settlement Motion") scheduled to be heard by the Court at the omnibus hearing on March 27, 2019.

The Debtors filed the Butte County Settlement Motion to authorize the Utility to continue performance under that certain Settlement Agreement and Mutual Release, dated October 4, 2018, between the People of the State of California represented by the District Attorney of Butte County, California and the Utility (the "Settlement Agreement"). Pursuant to the Settlement Agreement, the Utility agreed to provide funding to Butte County for an Enhanced Fire Prevention and Communications Program (the "Program") to be run and administered by the Butte County Fire Department. To fund the Program, the Utility agreed to pay the sum of up to \$1.5 million (of which no more than \$1 million remains to be paid) to be used, among other things, for the purposes of hiring inspectors, purchasing and funding inspection vehicles and a trailer, paying for related office equipment, and funding other expenses related to the Program.

The Singleton Law Firm Victim Claimants (the "SLF Claimants") filed a limited objection to the Butte County Settlement Motion on March 20, 2019 [Docket No. 986] (the "Objection"). Notably, the SLF Claimants support the relief requested in the Butte County Settlement Motion. The SLF Claimants assert, however, that the Court should nevertheless deny approval of the Butte County Settlement Motion unless the Court requires the Debtors to immediately pay the prepetition claims of the SLF Claimants that were settled by the Debtors prior to the Petition Date (the "Prepetition SLF Claims"). The SLF Claimants Objection also raises theories of constructive trust regarding certain insurance proceeds received by the Debtors. SLF Claimant Objection at 7-8: 23-21.

The SLF Claimants previously objected to the Debtors' motion seeking approval of their proposed debtor-in-possession financing (the "DIP Motion") on these same grounds, among others, seeking to condition approval of the DIP Motion and the Debtors' ability to borrow under their proposed 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

DIP financing on the immediate payment of the Prepetition SLF Claims. See Objection to Motion of Debtors Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. §§ 105, 362, 363, 364, 503, and 507, and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 2002, 4001, 6003, 6004, and 9014 for Interim and Final Orders (i) Authorizing the Debtors to Obtain Senior Secured, Superpriority, Postpetition Financing, (ii) Granting Liens and Superpriority Claims, (iii) Modifying the Automatic Stay, (iv) Scheduling Final Hearing, and (v) Granting Related Relief [Docket No. 804], at 5-8: 23-21. In overruling their objection to the DIP Motion, the Court observed the lack of a linkage between the SLF Claimants' requested payment and the DIP Motion, and that if the SLF Claimants believed they had valid theories of constructive trust, they should "tee up the motion as a separate motion and ask and make that case." 3/13/19 Hr'g Tr. 79-80: 24-1 and 81:12-13 (emphasis supplied).

As stated, the SLF Claimants have no objection to the relief requested in the Butte County Settlement Motion and no other parties in interest have filed any objection to such Motion. To the extent the SLF Claimants wish to seek relief to have their prepetition tort claims paid before all other prepetition tort claims, they should proceed by motion, on appropriate notice, so that the Debtors and all other parties in interest have the opportunity to respond and the Court can hear it and consider any such motion in the proper procedural context.

The Debtors respectfully request that the Court overrule the Objection and grant the relief requested in the Butte County Settlement Motion as a proper exercise of the Debtors' business judgment and in the best interests of their estates, creditors, shareholders, and all parties in interest.

Dated: March 24, 2019

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP **KELLER & BENVENUTTI LLP**

By: /s/ Jane Kim Jane Kim

Proposed Attorneys for Debtors and Debtors in Possession